	Case 2:25-cv-01156-DJC-AC Docume	nt 15 Filed 10/22/25 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	TYRELL AINSWORTH,	No. 2:25-cv-01156-DJC-AC
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER
14	CDCR, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16	Defendants.	
17	On July 18, 2025, Magistrate Judge Allison Claire issued Findings and	
18	Recommendations, which recommended that Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed In Forma	
19	Pauperis be denied under the three-strike provision of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). (ECF No.	
20	11.) On September 3, 2025, the Court adopted the Findings and Recommendations	
21	and denied Plaintiff's Motion. (ECF No. 13.) Plaintiff subsequently filed a document	
22	entitled "Objections to Magistrate Judge Findings and Recommendations" which the	
23	Court now construes as a Motion for Reconsideration in light of the Court's Order	
24	adopting those Findings and Recommendations. (ECF No. 14.)	
25	Plaintiff's Motion does not establish that reconsideration is warranted. Plaintiff	
26	focuses on Judge Claire's finding, now adopted by this Court, that Plaintiff's	
27	allegations did not demonstrate any risk of physical harm. (Id. at 1-3.) The allegations	

allegations did not demonstrate any risk of physical harm. (Id. at 1-3.) The allegations in the Complaint do not constitute imminent danger of serious physical injury so as to

28

	Case 2:25-cv-01156-DJC-AC Document 15 Filed 10/22/25 Page 2 of 2		
1	fall within the imminent danger exception of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). As such, the		
2	Findings and Recommendations and the Court's prior order adopting them were		
3	proper. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 14) is DENIED.		
4			
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
6	Dated: October 21, 2025		
7	Hon. Daniel <b>Jo</b> alabretta UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			